Vol. II. Numb. 89.

THE OBSERVATOR.

Reflections on the Speech for the Bill against Occasional Conformity.

From **Wednesday** February the 9th. to **Saturday** February the 12th, 1704.

Country-man. MAfter *Observator*, I have pick'd up another fine Speech for your perusal: Upon my Honest Word I think the People Sh--t Speeches at *London*; It's made by a topping Hand they say; but who makes his *Breeches* I can't tell: 'Tis a Speech for the Bill against *Occasional Conformity*. I find what you say of the *Tantivy* Writers, is very true; you have given us a true Mark whereby to know them. This *Speech-maker* also proceeds on the *three General Heads* of the *Party*: He writes against the *Bishops*, the *House of Lords*, and the *Late Reign*. These Folks are against all things that are good; and therefore 'tis my poor Country Opinion that every Honest Man in *England* ought to be *Tooth* and *Nail* against them; for my part I hate 'em every day more and more.

Obs. Honest *Country-man*, thou art disgruntled to a very high degree at this Paper; prithee let me see it.———Oh Brave! What do the Party talk of *Law?* I thought they had not been acquainted with *Law*, who can leap over the *Laws of Nature*, and the *Magna Charta* of *England*, to deprive *Englishmen* of their *Birth-Right*.———Oh! But 'tis an *Athenian* Law! *That when any Mutiny or Difference arose in the City of* Athens, *the Inhabitants should take one side or other, or else they Banish'd them the City.* But you must understand it, that this Law had not Respect to the *Mutinies* and *Contentions* of the *Boys*, at *Push-Pin*, or that the Citizens were engaged to take one side or other of an Inconsiderable Number of People; who Elevated with *Wine*, or Intoxicated with *Passion*, should run a Muck thro' the City. But how this Law is applicable to the Point in hand, is another Question: I think the People of *England* have declared themselves in their several Stations, for and against the *Occasional Conformity-Bill*; and I believe those against it, have a Majority of about Ten to One. And if the *Communitas Angliæ Popularis*, in whom is Virtually lodged the *Legislative Power* of the Common People; may be Judges of that *Bill*, I am certain it would be Condemn'd by them, as it is already by the *Legislative Body* of the *Nobility*.

But since our Author is gone back to the *Athenian Laws*; I'll tell thee, Honest *Country-man*, the *Athenian Statutes*, nay, the very Constitution of their Government, was against the *Bill* for preventing *Occasional Conformity*. Their Laws would not suffer any Persons to be admitted into Offices, but such as had deserved well of the Common-Wealth, and who were Persons knowing in the Employments they possessed; to neither of which Qualifications the *Occasional-Bill* had the least Respect. The *Athenians* never suffer'd their Officers to grow Great and Rich on the *Publick Spoils*, of the State; their good Services was their *Honour* and *Glory*; they never left great Estates to their Families; but their *Children* were the *Children* of the *Common-Wealth*, and were maintained and educated at the *Publick Charge*. The *Wise* and *Prudent* States of the *United Provinces* have followed the *Athenian* Examples, and do never suffer their Officers to grow rich on the *Publick*. Their chief *Ministers*, the *Pensionaries Place*, is not worth above 1500 *l. per Annum*. And to manage all those weighty Affairs, they have but one Minister; that great Man, the Pensionary *De Wit* left behind him but an Inconsiderable Estate; and *Monsieur Boreel*, who was *Plenipotentiary* at the Treaty of *Ryswick*, could give but 500 *l.* Portion to a Daughter.

If our Officers were kept within Bounds, and not suffer'd to Aggrandize their Fortunes on the *Publick:* If there was no such great Temptations to Offices, we should not have such Contending for them, we should not wrest *Religion* from its *Primitive Institution*, and make it shut and open the Door into Offices. *Qui festinat ad Divitias non erit Insons. He that makes haste to be Rich, can never be Innocent.* And if Enquiry was made on this head, we should find many *Guilty Men* in Offices.

Country-m. Good Sir, give us your Opinion of this Paragraph. I'll read it to you. *But, pray, Sir, let us enquire into the meaning of all this Trimming. Are we afraid to disoblige a Party of Men, that are against the* Church *and* Government? *Whose Principles of* Hatred *and* Malice, *to the Family of the* Stuarts, *Descends to them by Inheritance? Men, Sir, that offered open Violence to Her Majesties Royal* Grandfather; *Men that have not only the Impudence at this time to Justifie the* Fact, *but to turn the day of his* Murder *into* Ridicule, *and keep a* Calves-head *Feast in the City: And, can we imagine that those who are Enemies to Her Majesties* Person *and* Office, *and that were for hindring Her from coming to the* Throne, *would not be glad of any Opportunity to shove Her out of it?* Pray, Sir, are there a great many of those People alive that cut off the head of King *Charles* the First?

Obs. No, no, they are Dead, and gone a long Time ago: However, the Story serves some Men as *Raw-head and Bloody-Bones*, to affrighten some, and to Calumniate others. Now, for my part, I know nothing of the Business of King *Charles* the First; I was Born since the *Restauration*, and I have so high a value for the *Prudence* and *Justice* of our Fore-fathers, as not to Condemn any of their Actions for the *Common Good*; but upon *Good Grounds*, which we of this Age can never have in that particular; the Accounts thereof being so very *Partial*, that the Truth of that Action remains in *Obscurity*.

We are unkind to our selves, in Censuring the *Justice* of our Forefathers Actions; and thereby do give a Handle to our Successors to censure ours. Did our *Forefathers* Detruncate the *Father?* Did not we Depose the *Son*, and put one more Righteous in his Stead? Did we not Divest him of all his *Regalities*, make him a *Fugitive* on the Earth; and may not Future Ages examine the difference betwixt the *Decollation* and the *Abdication?* If our *Forefathers* were Guilty in what they did to the *Father*, they must Answer for it at the Great *Tribunal:* But what we did to the *Son* was altogether Conform to our Laws, *Precedented* by our *Ancestors*, and *Justifiable* by the Laws of *Nature*. King *Charles* the First is rais'd from the

Dead

Dead at every turn, to blemiſh the *Revolution*, and to ſully its *Honour*, and the *Juſtice* of the Cauſe. This is the Deſign of theſe Men in raking into the Aſhes of the Dead.

Country-m. Aye, Sir, that's the meaning of this Paragraph: I heard ſome *Perkinites* at a Coffee-Houſe ſpeak much againſt the *Revolution*, and ſay, That we did more than we could Anſwer, in Reſpect to King *James*; for that the Scripture ſaid, *Touch not my Anointed, and do my Prophets no Harm*, and that there are no Laws for Puniſhing of Kings.

Obſ. I hope no Body will be Angry with me for Juſtifiing the *Revolution*, ſince my Queen is the Queen of the *Revolution*; and ſince by it we were Re-inſtated in the Poſſeſſion of our *Religion*, and our *Juſt Rights* and *Properties*. ——— The Scripture you mention, is no way applicable to the Kings of *England*, it might be ſo to thoſe of *Judah* and *Iſrael*; but certain it is, it was not ſpoken *of* Kings, but *to* Kings, who were thereby Reproved and Enjoyned to do no Harm to the *Prophets* and *Saints of God*, there underſtood to be His *Anointed*. I told you before what we did to the late unhappy Prince, King *James*, was done according to Precedents of our *Anceſtors*. But ſuppoſe there had been no Preſidents? When the Crimes of a Perſon are without *Precedent*, we cannot ſuppoſe there ſhould be Laws for ſuch Crimes, for Laws are Enacted for the Puniſhment of Crimes that are known. The *Iſraelites* had neither *Law* nor *Precedent* for Puniſhing the *Benjamites* for their *Abominable Abuſe* of the *Levite's* Wife, and yet *God* himſelf owned that *Action*.

Where our *Law-Books* are ſilent, we muſt have *Recourſe* to the *Laws of Nature* and *Reaſon*; this is Juſtified by *Hiſtories* of all ſorts. In the *Roman Paricide*, they had no Law againſt him that ſhould kill his *Father*, becauſe it was thought impoſſible that any one could be ſo Un-Natural as to kill him, who gave him Life; yet on ſuch there was a more ſevere Puniſhment Inflicted, than on other *Homicides*; for they were thrown into the Sea in a great *Leathern-Veſſel*, with a *Dog*, a *Jack-a-Napes*, a *Cock* and *Viper*; living Emblems Significant of ſuch a Monſter. In the 20th of *Henry* the 8th, the Lord *Hungerford* was Executed for *Buggery*, before there was any Law poſitive to make it *Felony*; and before there was any Statute againſt *Witchcraft*, there were many *Witches* hang'd in *England*, becauſe it was Death by the Law of God.

Now, as the *Revolution* was warranted by our Laws, and as the Queen is the Bleſſing of that Unſpeakable Turn of *Providence*, we may conclude that Her Majeſty is ſafe in Her Throne, whilſt She has Perſons of *Revolution-Principles* about Her; and that Men of contrary *Principles*, are the only Enemies to Her Majeſties Perſon and Office, that they are the only Perſons that would have hinder'd Her from coming to the *Throne*, and wou'd be glad to ſhove Her out. *From ſuch Men, Good Lord deliver us.*

Country-m. Amen.

Obſ. His Reflections on the *Lords* the *Biſhops*, are *Villanous* and *Unmannerly*, particularly that on His Grace the Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury*, who is known to be a Prelate of that *Learning*, *Piety* and *Moderation*, that juſtly deſerves the Eſteem of all Good Men. But mark what he ſays of our Right Reverend Biſhops. *Since they are of the ſame Principles with the* Diſſenters, *it is but juſt, I think, that they ſhould ſtand on the ſame Foot.* Here's a fine Son of the *Church!* In Rebellion againſt his Fathers in God. In his next *Occaſional-Conformity-Bill*, he'll pop in a Clauſe to warrant him to Exclude the Biſhops from all *Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction*: But don't miſtake the Man neither; he is not Angry that the Biſhops are of the ſame Principles with the *Diſſenters*, but that the *Diſſenters* are of the ſame Principles with the Biſhops, that they can diſtinguiſh good Biſhops from bad, that they Value Honour and Reſpect them, for the *Divine* and *Moral Vertues* inherent in them, for their *Piety*, *Moderation*, and *Sincere Love* for the *Engliſh Liberties*; theſe *High-Flyers* are angry at all Men that Sow the Seeds of *Peace* and *Union*, being well aſſured that a good Harveſt of ſuch Fruit, will ſpoil the Kettle of Fiſh they are Boyling for the Court of St. *Germains*. As for the *Calves-Head Feaſt* in the City, he would have done well to have told us where it was kept, but I can aſſure him the Citizens of *London* don't value whatever Reflections are caſt upon them by the *Cods-Head* of the Kingdom.

He is pretty Modeſt with the *Temporal Lords*, he only ſtngles out the Lord *S——rs*, and when our *Speech-maker* ſhall arrive to the *Abilities* and *Honeſty* of that Noble Peer, we will allow him to be Familiar with his Character.

Country-m. But, Sir, don't forget the Securing Stroke, his Reflections on King *William*.

Obſ. Oh, here it is. *They may remember, if they pleaſe to Recollect, the Language in the late Reign*— Sir, you muſt turn this Gentleman out, or elſe I can't ſerve you. *And if any Gentleman was in the Intereſt of the Church of* England, *it was a ſufficient Exception of his being Employ'd. No Gentleman of that Principle was than thought fit to be a* Deputy Lieutenant, *or a* Juſtice of Peace.

His Reflections is *Groundleſs*, *Malicious* and *Scandalous*; King *William* prefer'd the beſt of *Churchmen*, and none elſe but *Churchmen*; for every one knows the *Sacramental-Teſt* is a Qualification for an Office. Your *Damme Blades* are not fit to be Employ'd in a *Chriſtian Government*, let 'em make what Pretenſions ſoever to the Church of *England*, and thoſe that are not ſuch Perſons, a certain will Party *Stigmatize* as *Diſſenters!* 'Tis a ſtrange thing that all the Vertue in the Kingdom muſt be laid at the *Diſſenters* Door, and that we can't have a Man of *Piety* and *Morality* but he muſt preſently be call'd a *Fanatick* and *Whig*.

Country-m. I'll be Hang'd if they don't call the *Juſtice of Peace* a *Whig*, who about five or ſix Weeks ago Committed a certain Topper to *New-Priſon*; the Caſe was thus, the Spark came to ſee his Lady about the bigneſs of a Whore, and fearing himſelf Cornuted, he enquir'd of the Maid who had been there? The Wench not willing to Expoſe the Secrets of her Miſtreſs to her Keeper, was not forward to anſwer a Miſchievous Queſtion, whereupon he took occaſion to break her Head with a Candleſtick, that ſhe cry'd out Murder; it ſo happen'd that a private Watch was Abroad that Night in Queſt after Whores and their Companions, and hearing this Out-cry, they came and ſeized the Gentleman, who told them he was a —— and threatned them ſeverely, and ſtruck one of the Conſtables, upon which the Watch knock't him down, and the Conſtables carried him before Mr. *Juſtice* —— who notwithſtanding his Pretenſions, Committed him to *New-Priſon*, and Bound him over the next Day.

Obſ. I'll engage our Author will not think that Gentleman fit to be a Juſtice of Peace. Prithee pick up ſome more of theſe Papers; by them I can give a gueſs when it will be high Water at St. *Germains*.

London, Printed by *J. How*, at the *Seven-Stars*, in *Talbot Court*, in *Grace-Church-Street*; and Sold by *E. Brags* at the *Blew-Ball*, in *Avemary-Lane*. 1704.